

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MICHAEL ANTHONY WRIGHT, SR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES BAYNTON, SCOTT HOFTIEZER
and BETH DITTMAN,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM

12-cv-870-bbc

In this case, plaintiff Michael Anthony Wright is proceeding on claims that defendants Charles Baynton and Scott Hoftiezer are violating the Eighth Amendment by failing to provide medical care for plaintiff's hepatitis C. In a February 5, 2014 order, I stayed the case and concluded that it would be appropriate for the court to locate counsel willing to represent plaintiff going forward.

Edward S. Sarskas and Tanya M. Salman have agreed to represent plaintiff, with the understanding that they will serve with no guarantee of compensation for their services. It is this court's intention that the scope of these lawyers' representation extends to proceedings in this court only.¹ Additionally, the court intends the scope of representation to be limited

¹ "Proceedings in this court" include all matters leading up to a final judgment on the merits, the filing of a Notice of Appeal, if appropriate, and ensuring that all steps are taken to transfer the record to the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

to litigating his current claims at trial. It will be unnecessary for counsel to file an amended complaint or otherwise relitigate matters already completed, although the court may be inclined to grant a limited extension of time for further discovery needed to try plaintiff's current claims, depending on the nature of the request.

Plaintiff should understand that because is he now represented in this case, he may not communicate directly with the court from this point forward. He must work directly with his lawyers and must permit them to exercise their professional judgment to determine which matters are appropriate to bring to the court's attention and in what form. Plaintiff does not have the right to require counsel to raise frivolous arguments or to follow every directive he makes. He should be prepared to accept the strategic decisions made by his lawyers even if he disagrees with some of them. If plaintiff decides at some point not to work with these lawyers, he is free to end their representation, but he should be aware that it is unlikely that the court will work to recruit a second set of lawyers to represent him.

The court will schedule a status conference to set the schedule for the remainder of proceedings in this lawsuit.

Entered this 28th day of February, 2014.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge

